

1 confused the "signal processing arrangement" shown at 10 in the drawings with the "signal
2 processor" shown at 14 in the drawings. The new claims presented above correct the error and
3 overcome the rejections under Section 112, first paragraph, and the objection to the drawings.

4 The Examiner rejected Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, due to phrase
5 "the signal stream junction." This language should have read "data stream junction" to be
6 consistent with the language used in the independent claim. New Claim 26 corresponds to
7 original Claim 5, and has been corrected.

8
9 III. The Claims are Allowable Over the Nakagoshi and Karasawa Patents

10 The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 6, 8, 13, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as
11 being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,541,963 to Nakagoshi. Claims 4-5, 7, 11-12, and 14-
12 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagoshi in
13 view of U.S. Patent No. 5,204,981 to Karasawa.

14 The Nakagoshi and Karasawa references both disclose diversity receiving arrangements
15 in which a strongest signal is chosen from among two or more separate receiving structures. It
16 is well known in diversity receiving arrangements that the separate receiving structures each
17 receive the very same signals. When signal strength through one receiving structure fades for
18 one reason or another, the diversity arrangement simply switches to receive signals from the
19 alternate receiving structure.

20 In contrast, the Applicants' invention is directed to a system in which multiple receiving
21 antennae receive signals which may be at the same frequency, but carry entirely different data.
22 The new independent claims, Claims 21, 28, and 35 are each clarified in this regard.

1 Claim 21 requires a controller for receiving a channel select input related to a desired
2 channel output. The desired channel output is an output to be formed from data received at
3 either the first switch or second switch. In response to the channel select input, the controller
4 functions to enable the one switch which receives the stream of data required to produce the
5 desired channel output. Thus, the required data may be directed on to the signal processor.
6 Claim 28 requires a similar controller element while Claim 35 requires the step of responding
7 to the channel select input by blocking at least one data stream which does not include the
8 required data.

9 The Nakagoshi reference discloses comparing the signal level of two identical data
10 streams to determine the higher signal level. Based upon the comparison results, a power
11 controller turns off power to the receiver producing the lower signal level, and a selector is
12 used to select the signal from the remaining receiver. Nothing in the Nakagoshi or Karasawa
13 references receives a channel select input related to a particular output or responds to such an
14 input. The Applicants therefore believe that Claims 21, 28, and 35 are not anticipated or
15 rendered obvious by Nakagoshi and/or Karasawa, and are entitled to allowance along with
16 each of their dependent claims.

17 The dependent claims include further structure or method steps not shown in the cited
18 references. Claims 22 and 29 require a signal processor controlled by the controller to
19 processing the data. Claims 23 and 30 further require a memory device for storing information
20 for each channel output, including signal processing information and the input path information
21 for the data required for the respective channel output. Corresponding method steps are set out
22 in Claims 36 and 37.



IV . Conclusion

For all of the above reasons the Applicants respectfully request consideration and allowance of Claims 21 through 40.

Should the Examiner believe that any issue remains as to the allowability of the claims or that a conference may expedite allowance of the claims, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney prior to issuing a further office action.

RECEIVED
APR 20 2000
2780 MAIL ROOM

Respectfully submitted,

SHAFFER & CULBERTSON, L.L.P.

Date: 14 April 2000

By: [Signature]
Russell D. Culbertson, Reg. No. 32,124
J. Nevin Shaffer, Jr., Reg. No. 29,858
1250 Capital of Texas Hwy. South
Building I, Suite 360
Austin, Texas 78746
512-327-8932
ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

Reg. No. 32,124, Russell D. Culbertson
Date of Deposit: 14 April 2000

L:\db\N-R\NPT\103\response_firstoa.wpd

A